



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,316	09/19/2003	Florence Defaix	006-040000US	7908
33486	7590	10/17/2006	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
HEIMBECHER & ASSOC., LLC			KIMBALL, MAKAYLA T	
P O BOX 33			[REDACTED]	ART UNIT
HAMEL, MN 55340-0033			[REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/666,316	DEFAIX ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Makayla Kimball	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/26/2004 01/05/2005</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-28 are pending and are considered below.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 4 it is missing the label of "yes" and "no". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 6, paragraph [0029]: "Fig. 8" supposed to be "Fig. 2".
- Page 7, paragraph [0033]:

- “proxy cache 304”, should be “202”
- Mentions step 420 and 422, there is no step 420 nor step 422 in figure 3.
- Page 8, paragraph [0034]: “proxy cache 304”, should be “202”
- Page 9, paragraph [0040]:
  - “fulfill” spelled wrong
  - i. “at step 510”, should be “at step 508”
- SSL should be spelled out

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 13-15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26 and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1: needs to have “and” after “b) at least one proxy...from said repository;”

Claim 2: needs a semicolon between “version control system” and “and an update informer”

Claim 4: remove first “and”, also needs a semicolon between “corresponding proxy” and “the proxy provides”; also another semicolon between “read-only cache when available” and “and by requesting”

Claim 5: needs a semicolon between “desired version is available” and “and requesting the version”

Claim 10: “plurality of proxy server” needs to be “plurality of proxy servers” also need a semicolon and “and” after “in a geographical area”

Claims 13 and 14: need a colon after “further comprising”

Claim 15: needs to have “and” after “d) a log of changes made to the repository;”

Claim 19: needs to have “and” after “b) at least one proxy...data from said repository”

Art Unit: 2191

Claim 20: need a colon after "further comprising"

Claim 22: remove first "and", also needs a semicolon between "corresponding proxy" and "the proxy provides"; also another semicolon between "read-only cache when available" and "and by requesting"

Claim 23: needs a semicolon between "desired version is available" and "and requesting the version"

Claim 26: need a comma after "according to claim 25"

Claim 28: "plurality of proxy server" needs to be "plurality of proxy servers" also need a semicolon and "and" after "in a geographical area"

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 2, 10 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 2 discloses an update informer, which was not disclosed in the specification, to enable one skilled in the art to make/use of the invention. For examination purposes, the examiner is interpreting this limitation as software.

Art Unit: 2191

Claims 10 and 28 disclose a regional proxy, which was not disclosed in the specification, to enable one skilled in the art to make/use of the invention. For examination purposes, the examiner is interpreting this limitation as a proxy.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-5 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jungck et al (Patent 7,114,008).

Claim 1:

A version control system for managing versioned files comprising:

a) A central server [Figure 5, "108"] for storing a repository of said versioned files; [Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]

b) At least one proxy connected to said central server; [Figure 5, "502"]

Art Unit: 2191

Each proxy including a read-only cache for storing data from said repository; [Column 28, lines 31-33, "The edge server 602 preferably further includes software and/or firmware provided in a read only memory..."]

c) At least one client connected to each of said proxies; and [Figure 5, "104"]

Wherein said modifications to said versioned files may only be made by said central server.

[Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]

Claim 2:

A version control system according to claim 1, wherein said central server includes a list of proxies for each branch in the version control system; and [Figure 6, "Server 1, 108" connected to "Edge Servers 602A and 602B"]

An update informer to notify each proxy in the list when a change is made to each branch.

[Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]

Claim 3:

A version control system according to claim 1, wherein said central server includes an access control system to validate requests received by said central server. [Column 46, lines 22-24, "In one embodiment, the adapter 800 authenticates any commands received to ensure they are from a valid sources."]

Art Unit: 2191

Claim 4:

A version control system according to claim 1, wherein said client obtains versions of files by requesting them from the corresponding proxy; [Column 24, lines 56-60, "the client 102, 104 is not redirected but either thinks that it is communicating with the server 108...specifically programmed to communicate its requests to the proxy server..."]

The proxy provides the version from its read-only cache when available; and [Column24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."]

By requesting the version from the central server otherwise. Column 24, lines 64-66, "However, when the requested content is not available in the cache storage (a cache miss), the request is proxied to the server 108 by the edge cache 508 and/or edge server..."]

Claim 5:

A version control system according to claim 1, wherein said proxy includes a mechanism for providing versions of files to connected clients using said read-only cache when the desired version is available; and [Column24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."]

Requesting the version from the central server otherwise. [Column 24, lines 64-66, "However, when the requested content is not available in the cache storage (a cache miss), the request is proxied to the server 108 by the edge cache 508 and/or edge server..."]

Claim 17:

Art Unit: 2191

A proxy server in a version control system including a central server containing a repository of versioned files and a client, said proxy server comprising:

- a) A read-only cache for storing data from said repository; and [Column24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."]
- b) A version provider to provide a version of a file to said client; [Column 14, lines 35-37, "the client 102, 104, 106 may need to be specially programmed to communicate its content requests to the proxy server in order to utilize the cache server."]

The version provider being configured to first check the read-only cache for the requested version [Column24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."] and if it is not found, to request the version from said central server. [Column 24, lines 64-66, "However, when the requested content is not available in the cache storage (a cache miss), the request is proxied to the server 108 by the edge cache 508 and/or edge server..."]

Claim 18:

A proxy server according to claim 17, wherein the read-only cache is configured to store copies of version requested from said central server. [Column 14, lines 45-46, "the cache server 208 saves a copy of the content in its cache for later requests."]

Claim 19:

A computer readable medium containing processor instructions for implementing a version control system including:

Art Unit: 2191

a) A central server [Figure 5, "108"] for storing a repository of said versioned files; [Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]

b) At least one proxy connected to said central server; [Figure 5, "502"]

Each proxy including a read-only cache for storing data from said repository; [Column 28, lines 31-33, "The edge server 602 preferably further includes software and/or firmware provided in a read only memory..."]

c) At least one client connected to each of said proxies; and [Figure 5, "104"]

Wherein said modifications to said versioned files may only be made by said central server.

[Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]

Claim 20:

A computer readable medium according to claim 19, further comprising:

Instructions to maintain a list of proxies for each branch in the version control system; and

[Figure 6, "Server 1, 108" connected to "Edge Servers 602A and 602B"]

Notify each proxy in the list when a change is made to each branch [Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]

Claim 21:

Art Unit: 2191

A computer readable medium according to claim 19, wherein said central server includes an access control system to validate requests received by said central server. [Column 46, lines 22-24, "In one embodiment, the adapter 800 authenticates any commands received to ensure they are from a valid sources."]

Claim 22:

A computer readable medium according to claim 19, wherein said client obtains versions of files by requesting them from the corresponding proxy;

The proxy provides the version from its read-only cache when available; and [Column 24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."]

By requesting the version from the central server otherwise. . [Column 24, lines 64-66, "However, when the requested content is not available in the cache storage (a cache miss), the request is proxied to the server 108 by the edge cache 508 and/or edge server..."]

Claim 23:

A computer readable medium according to claim 19, wherein said proxy includes a mechanism for providing versions of files to connected clients using said read-only cache when the desired version is available; and [Column 24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."]

Requesting the version from the central server otherwise. [Column 24, lines 64-66, "However, when the requested content is not available in the cache storage (a cache miss), the request is proxied to the server 108 by the edge cache 508 and/or edge server..."]

Art Unit: 2191

9. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haikin (Patent 6,757,893).

Claim 11:

A method of modifying a repository of versions of files in a version control system including a central server and a client, said method comprising the steps of:

- a) The client requesting from the central server a lock on a version of a file in the version control system; [Column 2, lines 16-19, "While the source code file is checked-out to one of the software developers, other software developers are locked-out and prevented from making any changes to the source code file..."]
- b) The central server checking whether the requested version is unlocked, and if so granting the request; and [Column 2, lines 11-14, "access to the individual source code files is controlled by allowing each particular source code file to be checked-out to only one software developer at a time for modification..."]
- c) The central server sending an update to other portions of the system. [Column 1, lines 38-40, "The edited source code files are then used to re-build the software system, thereby incorporating the changes and modifications made by the software developers."]

Claim 12:

A method according to claim 11, wherein said lock prevents other clients from modifying said version of said file. [Column 2, lines 52-55, "the lock-out mechanism utilized by traditional version control tools... preventing other software developers from working on a source code file that has been checked-out."]

Art Unit: 2191

Claim 13:

A method according to claim 11, further comprising:

The step of said client modifying said version and returning the modification to said central server. [Column 2, lines 24-28, "modifications are introduced to the master copy of the source code file from the local copy of the source code file that was edited by the software developer who checked-out the source code file."]

Claim 14:

A method according to claim 13, further comprising:

The step of said central server sending said modification to other portions of the system. [Column 1, lines 38-40, "The edited source code files are then used to re-build the software system, thereby incorporating the changes and modifications made by the software developers."]

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2191

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claims 6-10, 15, 16 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jungck et al (Patent 7,114,008) in view of Allen et al (Patent 5,675,802).

Claim 6:

Jungck discloses the system in claim 1 above. However, Jungck does not disclose clients modifying the repository through said server. In the same field of endeavor, Allen discloses clients [Column 5, lines 58-60, "single user"] modifying the repository through said central server [Column 5, lines 58-60, "modify each branch...at the local development site."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate modifying versions into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses periodic updates. One would have been motivated to incorporate modification of each branch because a version file with bugs needs to be fixed.

Claim 7:

Jungck and Allen disclose the system in claim 6 above. Jungck does not disclose the central server includes a checkout mechanism for controlling modification to repository. However, Allen further discloses a checkout mechanism [Column 7, lines 29-31, "Each branch can be independently checked out and checked in..."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a checkout mechanism into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses periodic updates. One would have been motivated to incorporate a checkout mechanism so other software developers will not be able to make modifications on the same file.

Art Unit: 2191

Claim 8:

Jungck and Allen disclose the system in claim 7 above. Jungck does not explicitly state that the central server includes a log of changes made to repository. However, Allen further discloses a log of changes made [Column 9, lines 30-31, "As changes are made to the replica, a record of each change is stored as a entry in an operations log in the replica."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a log of changes made into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses updating. One would have been motivated to incorporate a log of changes so other software developers accessing the version will know what changes were made.

Claim 9:

Jungck and Allen disclose the system according to claim 8 above. Jungck does not explicitly disclose a log to update a proxy. However, Allen further discloses a log to update a proxy [Column 9, lines 31-33, "The exchanger exports changes made to the replica to remote replicas by generating a synchronization packet."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate exporting changes made to remote replicas into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses updating. One would have been motivated to incorporate exporting changes because one will want to propagate changes to the proxy servers.

Claim 10:

Jungck discloses the system according to claim 1 above. However, Jungck does not disclose a regional proxy nor a central server sending updates to a regional proxy. In the same field of endeavor, Allen does disclose a regional proxy [Column 3, lines 11-13, "version control system

and method for supporting geographically distributed software development at multiple sites..."] and a central server sending updates to a regional proxy. [Column 4, lines 1-4, "The exchanger periodically updates the local replica by providing new versions of target files to geographically remote development sites..."] Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate providing updates to remote development sites into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses periodic updates. One would have been motivated to incorporate providing updates to remote development sites because one will want geographically distributed software developers to get the most up-to-date files.

Claim 15:

Jungck discloses a central server [Figure 5, "108"] with a repository of files [Column 25, lines 8-11, "the content of the server 108 coupled with periodic updates either initiated by the edge server 502 or edge cache 508 or periodically pushed to the edge cache by the server 108"]. Jungck also discloses read-only caches [Column 24, lines 61-63, "The edge cache 508 operates as a normal cache server as described above, attempting to satisfy content requests from its cache storage."]. Jungck also discloses a list of proxies [Figure 6, "Server 1, 108" connected to "Edge Servers 602A and 602B"]. However, Jungck does not disclose a version manager for providing versioned files, an access control system for managing requests from clients to modify repository nor a log of changes made to repository. In the same field of endeavor Allen does disclose a version manager for providing versioned files [Column 4, lines 1-3, "The exchanger periodically updates the local replica by providing new versions of target files..."] and an access control system for managing requests to modify versioned files [Column 3, lines 59-61, "the local replica (and each remote replica) restricts the capability to modify each branch to a single user at a time at the local (and each remote) development site."]. Allen also discloses a log of

Art Unit: 2191

changes made [Column 9, lines 30-31, "As changes are made to the replica, a record of each change is stored as a entry in an operations log in the replica."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a version control manager, access control system and a log of changes into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses modifications to files. One would have been motivated to incorporate the above mentioned features because one will want to control modifications made to the files and to note changes made to the file for debugging purposes.

Claim 16:

Jungck and Allen disclose the central server according to claim 15 above. Jungck does not disclose a log to update a proxy. However, Allen further discloses a log to update a proxy [Column 9, lines 31-33, "The exchanger exports changes made to the replica to remote replicas by generating a synchronization packet."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate exporting changes made to remote replicas into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses updating. One would have been motivated to incorporate exporting changes because one will want to propagate changes to the proxy servers.

Claim 24:

Jungck discloses computer readable medium in claim 19 above. However, Jungck does not disclose clients modifying the repository. In the same field of endeavor, Allen discloses clients [Column 5, lines 58-60, "single user"] modifying the repository through said central server [Column 5, lines 58-60, "modify each branch...at the local development site."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate modifying versions into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses periodic

Art Unit: 2191

updates. One would have been motivated to incorporate modification of each branch because a version file with bugs needs to be fixed.

Claim 25:

Jungck and Allen disclose the computer readable medium in claim 24 above. Jungck does not disclose a checkout mechanism. Allen further discloses a checkout mechanism [Column 7, lines 29-31, "Each branch can be independently checked out and checked in..."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a checkout mechanism into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses periodic updates. One would have been motivated to incorporate a checkout mechanism so other software developers will not be able to make modifications on the same file.

Claim 26:

Jungck and Allen disclose the computer readable medium in claim 25 above. Jungck does not disclose a log of changes made. Allen further discloses a log of changes made [Column 9, lines 30-31, "As changes are made to the replica, a record of each change is stored as a entry in an operations log in the replica."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a log of changes made into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses updating. One would have been motivated to incorporate a log of changes so other software developers accessing the version will know what changes were made.

Claim 27:

Art Unit: 2191

Jungck and Allen disclose the computer readable medium according to claim 26 above. Jungck does not disclose a log to update a proxy. Allen further discloses a log to update a proxy [Column 9, lines 31-33, "The exchanger exports changes made to the replica to remote replicas by generating a synchronization packet."]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate exporting changes made to remote replicas into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses updating. One would have been motivated to incorporate exporting changes because one will want to propagate changes to the proxy servers.

**Claim 28:**

Jungck discloses the computer readable medium according to claim 19 above. However, Jungck does not disclose a regional proxy nor a central server sending updates to a regional proxy. In the same field of endeavor, Allen does disclose a regional proxy [Column 3, lines 11-13, "version control system and method for supporting geographically distributed software development at multiple sites..."] and a central server sending updates to a regional proxy. [Column 4, lines 1-4, "The exchanger periodically updates the local replica by providing new versions of target files to geographically remote development sites..."] Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate providing updates to remote development sites into Jungck, since Jungck already discloses periodic updates. One would have been motivated to incorporate providing updates to remote development sites because one will want geographically distributed software developers to get the most up-to-date files.

***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2191

14. "A distributed version control system for wide area networks" – discloses a version control system

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Makayla Kimball whose telephone number is 571-270-1057. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8AM - 2PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*MTK*  
MTK  
09/29/2006

Wei Y Zhen  
Supervisory Patent Examiner

*W.Y.Z.*  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
WEI Y ZHEN